

whether they shall have unlimited power to call Conventions, are questions that may come up hereafter. But whatever mode be adopted, I want the doctrine plainly declared that the members of the Legislature shall stand under the Constitution, and not take shelter under the retroactive operation of a vote of the people.

Mr. DANIEL. There was a similar provision in the old Constitution; that it should not be amended but in a certain way.

Mr. CLARKE. The members of the Legislature acted as revolutionists.

Mr. DANIEL. I believe revolution is a favorite doctrine with the gentleman; not secession, but revolution. The people and the Legislature will again claim the same right of revolution. I would suggest that when the article on amendments to the Constitution comes up for consideration, that is the proper time for the gentleman to offer amendments, if he has any. I do not say I am prepared to vote for the article as reported, nor do I say I shall vote against it. But I think that is the proper time and the proper place for amendments of this kind.

Mr. STIRLING. I shall vote for this amendment, for I think it provides the same guarantee already in the bill of rights, but in a better form. I am perfectly well aware that whether there is or not any power or right in this matter, the thing will be done; and the only way to secure the proper exercise of the power is by imposing restrictions upon the Legislature. I am not afraid of any alteration of the Constitution except through the Legislature. If the people undertake to assemble in primary meetings without any call from the Legislature or the Executive, it will depend entirely upon whether there are enough people in favor of it. I want to provide in the Constitution an easy method of amending the Constitution, and then I want to confine the Legislature to that method. I believe this amendment puts it in a more definite form than the other proposition does; and I shall vote for it.

The question was upon the amendment of Mr. CLARKE, to strike out all of Article 44 after the word "That," and insert:

"The Legislature shall pass no law providing for an alteration, change, or abolishment of this Constitution, except in the manner therein prescribed and directed."

Upon this question Mr. CLARKE called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The question being taken, by yeas and nays, upon the amendment, it resulted—yeas 40, nays 17—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Baker, Barron, Bond, Brown, Clarke, Cunningham, Cushing, Dail, Davis of Washington, Duvall, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Harwood, Henkle, Hodson, Hopkins, Hopper, Horsey, Keefer, Kennard, King, Lansdale, Larsh, Markey, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Nyman, Parker, Ridgely,

Schlosser, Scott, Smith of Carroll, Sneary, Stirling, Swope, Wickard, Wooden—40.

Nays—Messrs. Abbott, Daniel, Earle, Hatch, Hebb, Jones of Cecil, Jones of Somerset, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Noble, Robinette, Russell, Smith of Worcester, Stockbridge, Thomas, Todd—17.

The amendment was accordingly adopted.

The question recurred upon the motion of Mr. TODD to strike out the entire section.

Mr. TODD. As it seems to be the sense of this Convention that there shall be an article in the bill of rights upon this subject, I will withdraw the motion to strike out.

The motion to strike out was accordingly withdrawn.

Mr. BARRON moved that when the Convention adjourn to-day, it be to meet on Monday next.

Before the question was taken—

On motion of Mr. CUSHING—

The Convention adjourned.

THIRTIETH DAY.

SATURDAY, June 11, 1864.

The Convention met at 10 o'clock, A. M., (Mr. Scott in the chair.)

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. McNemar.

The roll was called, and the following members answered to their names:

Messrs. Abbott, Annan, Baker, Brown, Clarke, Cunningham, Cushing, Davis of Washington, Duvall, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Harwood, Hebb, Henkle, Hopkins, Hopper, Horsey, Jones of Cecil, Jones of Somerset, Keefer, King, Larsh, Markey, McComas, Mitchell, Miller, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Nyman, Parker, Parran, Robinette, Russell, Schlosser, Scott, Smith of Carroll, Smith, of Worcester, Sneary, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Todd, Valliant, Wickard, Wooden—50.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

APPRENTICESHIP OF COLORED MINORS.

Mr. TODD submitted the following:

Ordered, That the Committee on the Judicial Department be instructed to inquire into the expediency of incorporating into the Constitution a provision making it the duty of the Legislature to provide by law for the apprenticeship, by courts of competent jurisdiction, of emancipated negroes, who are minors, so as to better provide for their welfare and preparation for freedom.

Mr. TODD said. I do not deem it necessary to make any speech explaining the object of this order. I suppose as a mere matter of courtesy it will be referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. STIRLING. I am opposed to that article. In the first place the Judiciary Committee has nothing to do with the subject matter embraced in it. If it should go to any committee, it should go to the Committee on the